

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Group Art Unit: 3683

Dale Crombez

Examiner: Christopher P. Schwartz

Serial No.: 10/708,516

Filed: March 9, 2004

For: VEHICLE AND METHOD FOR CONTROLLING REGENERATIVE  
BRAKING

Attorney Docket No.: 81044472 / FMC 1643 PUS

**REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.41**

*Entd  
Approved  
CFS  
11/27/06*

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer mailed on 31 July 2006. Appellants maintain the arguments stated in the Appeal Brief, and further clarify some of these arguments below.

In responding to Appellants' arguments—see Section 10, Response to Argument of the Examiner's July 31 Answer—the Examiner again states that the claim limitations of claims 1, 13 and 18 are taught by the Schneider and Hara et al. references because of the "undue breadth" of the claims. In particular, the Examiner states that certain claim limitations "are so broad in scope, and well known in the art, that they are not specifically mentioned in

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

This paper, including all enclosures referred to herein, is being electronically filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office EFS-Web System on September 28, 2006.